DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 330 HE 025 115

AUTHOR Townsend, Barbara K.
TITLE The Impact of Feminist Scholarship upon the Study of Higher Education: An Analysis of Two Higher Education Journals. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Boston, MA, October 31-November 3, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Change; Comparative Analysis; *Feminism; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Postsecondary Education; *Scholarly Journals; Scholarship; *Sex Bias; *Sex Fairness; Sexism in Language; Trend Analysis; Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This study examined 509 articles within the "Journal of Higher Education" (JHE) and "The Review of Higher Education" (RHE) for evidence of influence by feminist scholarship. The study covered the time periods of the late 1960's, the late 1970's, and the late 1980's. Findings are broken down and discussed within each time frame and include the following: (1) women, whether as topics of research, researchers, or simply as higher education faculty, student, or administrators were all but invisible in the literature of the late 1960's; (2) the presence of women became slightly more apparent in both journals during the late 1970's; and (3) the late 1980's shows a significant increase in articles involving women. The presence of women as scholars in each of the time sequences studied is also discussed, and reveals increasing numbers of articles in this area over the decades. Finally, feminist phase theory is examined through 16 articles which focused exclusively on women or on topics commonly associated with them. Contains 53 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339330

The Impact of Feminist Scholarship Upon the Study of Higher Education: An Analysis of Two Higher Education Journals

Barbara K. Townsend
School of Education
Loyola University of Chicago

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara Townsend

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 025 115

Paper presented at the 1991 Annual Meeting of the Association for Study of Higher Education. Boston, Massachusetts, November 1991.

Acknowledgement: The study was conducted with the assistance of my higher education research assistant in 1990-91, Ceclia Corey, who joined me in an examination of the literature and who spent many hours with me discussing the nature of feminist scholarship.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Park Plaza Hotel & Towers in Boston, Massachusetts, October 31-November 3, 1991. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

As a multidisciplinary field of study, higher education derives its conceptual frameworks and methodologies from a variety of disciplines in the social sciences and humanities. Over the past two decades contemporary feminism has significantly influenced these disciplinary areas through stimulating a reexamination of their scholarship and curriculum and a development of new research paradigms (DuBois, Kelly, Kennedy, Korsmeyer, and Robinson 1985, Farnham 1987, Langland and Gove 1981). Scholars in these disciplines have also turned the conceptual lens of feminism upon the academy itself, including its treatment of women students, faculty, and staff. As examples, historians Barbara Solomon (1985), Helen Horowitz (1985), and Lynn Gordon (1990) have traced the development of college education for women; psychologist Mirra Komarovsky (1985) has studied how female college students develop their feminine identities; and literature scholar Nadya Aisenberg and political scientist Mona Harrington (1988) have examined the condition of women faculty. Regardless of disciplinary affiliation, for those who study the field of higher education, "feminist research promises to make visible the experience of specific women and groups of women within the academy and place these experiences within a larger political context" (Treichler 1985, p. 46). Ultimately, the insights gained from this research may lead to "making the academy a [more] fruitful place for women [and men] to live and work" (p. 7).

If feminist scholarship is to influence the operation as well as the study of the academy, the scholarship needs to be disseminated to higher education scholars, those individuals whose

scholarly interests always or primarily focus upon some aspect of higher education. These scholars may be faculty who conduct research and teach about higher education, or they may be practitioners who, while holding faculty or administrative positions in colleges and universities, wish to understand higher education from a theoretical perspective. Since "perhaps journals both create and mirror their fields" (Silverman 1987), inclusion of feminist scholarship in higher education's mainstream refereed journals would seem both a necessary condition and an indication of feminist scholarship's ability to influence higher education as a field of study.

Determining whether published scholarship is feminist in its conceptual orientation is not always as easy as it may seem. First of all, the recipe for feminist scholarship is not simply "add women and stir" (Neitz 1989). Research which includes women by using sex or gender as a variable is not automatically feminist scholarship. Even if the research focuses on women's experiences only, it is not necessarily feminist in orientation. Feminist scholars seek to examine women's everyday or "personal" experiences within the conceptual framework that political, social, and economic oppression by gender is a reality which has shaped these experiences. In so doing, feminist scholars have criticized contemporary research paradigms for "denying the subjectivity of the researcher," "sanctioning a power imbalance between researcher and subject," and "devaluing and even denying the reality of women's experiences" (Townsend 1990, p. 14). Regarding this last

point, researchers working from the positivist perspective of one verifiable reality ascertainable by the researcher tend to discount or exclude "the possibility that women could be 'knowers' or agents of knowledge" (Harding 1987, p. 3). Finally, by addressing questions whose answers might improve women's condition, many feminist scholars aim for the "transforming [of] patriarchy and the empowerment of women" (Sprague and Zimmerman 1989, p. 77).

Feminist phase theory (Tetreault 1985) is a useful way to categorize scholarship in terms of its thinking about women. Developed as a "classification schema of the evolution in thought . . . about the incorporation of women's traditions, history, and experiences into selected disciplines" (p. 364), feminist phase theory enables us to trace the development of scholarly thought about women. It has five phases: (1) male scholarship, (2) compensatory scholarship, (3) bifocal scholarship, (4) feminist scholarship, and (5) multifocal or relational scholarship. In the initial phase, **male** or androcentric scholarship, women are virtually invisible. Gender is not used as a variable because there is no conception that man's experience is not universal. In the next or **compensatory** phase, scholarship compensates for the previous stage's omission of women by seeking out and focusing on the exceptional women who are "as good as" men. Male experience is still regarded as the norm, and male standards are the criteria for excellence. **Bifocal** scholarship, the third phase, focuses upon men and women as two different, equal, and complementary groups, each of which is homogeneous. Gender may be used as a variable, but

with little or no explanation for its use. Ethnic, racial, social class, and sexual orientation differences within each group are not considered. Also bifocal scholarship sees women's oppression as a problem which must be overcome, usually through programs geared to assist them to become members of the status quo, i.e., men. The fourth phase is **feminist** in which women are studied and valued in and of themselves. "[W]omen's activities, not men's, are the measure of significance" (p. 347). Additionally, women are no longer viewed as a homogeneous group. Experiential differences according to race, ethnicity, social class, sexual orientation, and marital status are acknowledged. A multidisciplinary approach is often used to address "[q]uestions of sex and gender as set within historical, ideological, and cultural contexts" (p. 374). Awareness of the limitations of existing theoretical frameworks and methodologies in addressing women's experiences leads to efforts to develop new ones. The fifth phase, **multifocal or relational** scholarship, is rarely achieved. In this phase scholarship focuses on the dynamics of the relationships between the two genders. Rather than viewing human experience as male or female, it is seen holistically, with "'maleness' and 'femaleness'. . . [being] perceived as a continuum of humanness" (p. 375). While the five phases imply a progression in thought, labeling a piece of scholarship as representing one of the early phases is not intended as condemnatory, merely as descriptive.

Feminist phase theory has rarely been applied to higher education scholarship. However, Susan Twombly (in press) did use

this schemata in an effort to understand how women in community colleges have been conceptualized in the literature. In examining over 170 education journal articles which were published between 1970 and 1989 and which focused on sex/gender in two-year colleges, Twombly found that six percent of the articles exemplified the male phase, 21.3% the compensatory, 53.4% the bifocal, 14.9% the feminist, and less than one percent the multifocal. Almost 51% of the articles were published between 1970-79, over 35% between 1980-84, and 14% between 1985-1989. She concluded:

> [T]hinking about women in the community colleges has largely been compensatory and bifocal and only to a lesser extent feminist in which women's experiences are valued in their own right. Neither has thinking about women changed much during the twenty years encompassed by this study.

While they did not use feminist phase theory, several researchers collectively tried to measure the impact of feminist scholarship upon the field of education (not just higher education). As part of their examination of feminist scholarship in the five disciplines of anthropology, education, history, literature, and philosophy, Ellen DuBois, Gail Kelly, Elizabeth Kennedy, Carolyn Korsmeyer, and Lillian Robinson (1985) selected ten major journals in each of these disciplines. For the years 1966-1980 they used the contents of these journals as a data base for determining the extent to which women were the subject of inquiry in disciplinary research. Their method was to count the titles of articles which focused on women or a topic associated

with women. When looking at education journals,[1] the authors did not count studies which used gender as just one of several variables since gender has traditionally been a variable in education research.[2]

This title counting indicated that each discipline, including education, has slowly increased its focus on women during the years in the study. For all five disciplines, 1.88% of the 1,546 articles in 1966 were about women or a topic associated with them as compared to 7.41% of the 1,484 articles in 1980. In the education journals, this was so for 1.80% of the 1966 articles as compared to 6.08% in 1980. The authors were surprised by the low count for education journals. Other than the educational psychological journals, "most of the journals either ignore women's concerns entirely, run a special issue on the topic without publishing such research in subsequent years, or after 1970 slow down the rate of publication of such research" (p. 176). According to the authors, one possible explanation for this phenomenon is education's reluctance, as a relatively new discipline, to incorporate feminist scholarship until other, more prestigious disciplines have done so (p. 177).

The authors also attempted a more general assessment of the influence of feminist scholarship by examining ten journals (including the educational journals Teachers' College Record and Harvard Educational Review) for the years 1979 and 1980. This time they focused on the articles not previously designated as being about women. They looked for manifestations of the general

influence of feminism by searching for gender inclusive language, citation of feminist works, and "the recognition of the relevance of a particular point to women" (p. 180). They also attempted to judge if these articles could have shown a feminist influence, e.g., they could have referred to women and gender, they could, indeed, should have included well known feminist research in the discipline. The authors concluded that "despite the growing body of feminist scholarship, by and large male-biased disciplinary frameworks remain firmly entrenched" (p. 181).

Studies of higher education journal articles have also found an increase in the number of articles focusing on women as well as an increase in the number of women authors. This was the finding of George Kuh, John Bean, Russell Bradley, Michael Coomes, and Deborah Hunter (1986) when they examined the research on college students as it appeared in 11 journals[3] between 1968 and 1983. In another article using the same data base, John Bean and George Kuh (1988) reported that 157 (13.2%) of the 1189 articles reviewed were authored by women and 222 (20.3%) coauthored by women and men. Bean and Kuh also found that women were more apt to write about women and have female samples than were men. Discussing this finding, Bean and Kuh suggested that changes in societal attitudes about the role of women "may have influenced the topics subsequently studied by women . . . . The rise of feminism in the 1960s and 1970s also may have stimulated women (sic) researchers to use female samples to learn more about experiences of women during the college years" (p. 138). It is interesting to note that Bean

and Kuh do not suggest that the research of male scholars could also have been influenced by feminism.

Silverman (1987) also indicated the gender of senior authors in his study of higher education journal articles. Examining the contents of eight journals[4] published during 1975-1981 by randomly selecting half the issues in each volume year, Silverman found that for the 1,103 articles he examined, over 16% had a female senior author. In the Journal of Higher Education, over 17% had a female senior author; in The Review of Higher Education, over 11%.

A comparison of female authorship in other professional fields is provided by C. Glenn Walters, Elaine Hobbs Fry, and Breck D. Chaisson's (1990) study of 27 business journals and by Pamela Cooper, Lea P. Stewart, and Sheryl A. Friedley's (1989) study of communication journals. Seeking to determine women scholars' impact on scholarship in business schools by examining authorship of journal articles[5] for the years 1962-1984, Walters, Fry, and Chaisson found a total of 31,617 authors, 7.7% of whom were female and 88.8% male. The total number of female authors increased from 2.7% in 1962 to 15.8% in 1984. In none of the 27 journals were women more than 27% of the authors. Cooper et al. (1989) examined not only the authorship of articles in selected communication journals[6] during 1967-86 but also the proportion of articles on communication and gender. They found an increase in the number of women first authors (8.2% in 1967 compared to 17.8& in 1986) and an increase in the percentage of articles on gender-related topics (from .07% in 1967 to 7.5% in 1986).

The above studies indicate various possible measures of the influence of feminism and feminist scholarship upon a discipline or field of study: percentage of women authors (primary or co), articles focusing on women or topics associated with women, frequency of use of sex/gender as a variable or factor, use of gender-inclusive language, references to feminist literature, and appearance of scholarship classified as feminist according to feminist phase theory.

METHODS AND DATA SOURCE

The purpose of this study was to examine examples of mainstream higher education scholarship for evidence of influence by feminist scholarship.[7] Specifically, I reviewed the scholarship published in two major higher education journals, Journal of Higher Education (JHE) and The Review of Higher Education (RHE) over three time periods: the late 1960s, the late 1970s, and the late 1980s. I chose JHE because of its long history as a journal focusing on higher education as well as its affiliation with the American Association for Higher Education. I chose RHE as the journal sponsored by the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), the primary professional organization for those who study the field of higher education. The time period 1967-69 was selected to provide a snapshot of higher education scholarship at a time when feminist scholarship was just beginning to influence the disciplines from which higher education derives its conceptual

frameworks and methodologies. I selected a ten-year interval between time periods to provide sufficient time for the influence of feminist scholarship to emerge in scholarship focused on higher education--if not by the late '70s, then by the late '80s. Given that RHE did not come into existence until Fall 1977, JHE was the only source of articles during the late '60s. Since I started my examination of RHE with its first issue, the time period for RHE is Fall 1977-Summer 1980 and Fall 1987-Summer 1990.

I reviewed a total of 509 articles, essay reviews, ongoing dialogues, and commentaries: 377 in JHE and 129 in RHE. In this review I sought the presence of women, either as authors or as subjects of inquiry, by determining the number and percentage of articles[8] where (1) a woman was sole or primary author, (2) a woman was a co-author[9] (including with a female primary author), (3) the focus was on women or a topic usually associated with women, e.g., sexual harassment, and (4) sex/gender was a variable or factor in an empirical study. To measure the possible influence of feminist scholarship on articles not placed in either of the preceding two categories, I determined the number and percentage of articles in which (5) gender-inclusive language was used or some other indication was given that women existed, e. g., a female research subject or author[10] was quoted within the article, and (6) the article's references included at least one reference to a work whose title indicated a focus on women. Finally, I used feminist phase theory to classify each article which focused primarily or only on women or a topic usually associated with women.

FINDINGS[11]

Presence of women in the 1960s. Not surprisingly, male scholarship dominated the Journal in the late 1960s. Women, whether as topics of research, researchers, or simply as higher education faculty, student, or administrators were almost invisible (Table 1). After reviewing the 166 articles published in JHE from 1967 through 1969, a female graduate student who collected the articles for me on this project said, "I feel as though women have not been discovered yet when I read these [articles]."

Because gender-inclusive language was rarely used during this period, the subliminal impression one receives in reading the Journal during this time period is that almost all students, faculty, and administrators, and higher education scholars were male. For example, in Marvin Lasser's (1967) article on a sense of academic community, we read:

> As a teacher, institutional policy determines the kinds and numbers of students he teaches, the courses he offers, the place of his discipline in the curriculum, the degree of rigor he exercises in assignments and grades, the hours he keeps, sometimes even the textbooks he chooses (p. 64).

Similarly Patricia Plante (1968), in writing about beginning college students, says:

> [H]e comes to the starting line with the hope, the energy, and the excitement of the uninitiated. To him

> all things are possible because nothing has been tried yet. He most frequently views learning as he views his life, namely as non-cumulative (p. 209).

Only one of the articles during this period focused on women: M. M. Chambers' (1967) "Operation Second Chance: Mature Women in College and Graduate School," in which Chambers discusses the advantages to women, to higher education, and to society if older women go or return to college. Additionally, while few of the articles during this time period were empirical studies, only 2 (1%) of the 166 articles studied used sex/gender as a variable.

The presence of women as scholars was not much more apparent. Women were the primary or sole author of 9 articles (5%) and coauthors of 4 (2%).

In those articles which did not focus on women or did not use sex/gender as a variable, there were occasional indications that women existed. Twenty-two of these articles (13% of the 166 articles) used gender-inclusive language or mentioned women in some way. Usually when women were mentioned, it was as "wives" to the faculty or students, e.g., Collings 1967; Holmes 1969; Sorenson and Kagan 1967. The only reference to women in an article on leadership reflects the apparent irrelevance of women to higher education leadership during this time:

> It is said of a girl that if she does not have the intangible quality described as "charm" (whatever that may be), it doesn't much matter what else (figure, bust, or singing voice) she does have. So it is with

> the university president: if he does not have that intangible capacity to administer the affairs of a large institution, it doesn't much matter what else he does have--a Nobel prize, a list of books he has written, or the presidency of his national professional organization (Corson 1969, p. 185).

Probably needless to say, none of the authors of the articles not previously counted used any references to works whose title included a focus on women.

Presence of women in the 1970s. The finding that in the late 1960s women were almost invisible in the Journal serves as a benchmark to compare the presence of women in the 1970s and 1980s in the Journal (Table 2) and the Review (Table 3). I found that in the late 1970s the presence of women was more apparent in JHE than in the 1960s and was also apparent in RHE but not to any great extent.

The most obvious sign of women's presence was in the authorship of articles. The presence of women authors in JHE (either as primary or co) increased from 7% of the articles in the late 1960s to 22% (14% primary and 8% co) in the late 1970s. In RHE the percent of articles authored by women was 14% (12% primary or sole and 2% co).

Women also appeared as the subjects of research but not to any great extent. In JHE they were the primary focus in 4% of the articles. In RHE it was 2%. Sex/gender was used as a variable in 11% of the articles in JHE and 6% in RHE. These figures should not

be interpreted to mean that sex/gender could have been a variable in the rest of the articles. Many of the articles, particularly in RHE, were essays or literature reviews, not empirical studies.

Exclusionary language was still apparent in these journals. Although but one of several examples (e.g., Beardsley 1977; Kellams 1977; MacGregor and McInnis 1977; Stewart 1978), this quotation from the lead article in the first issue of The Review, James Bess's (1977) "The Academic Profession in Transition" is typical:

> The point is made that each faculty member himself must provide the integration of the missions . . . . Each faculty member must find ways of integrating the latest research results into his lectures; each faculty member must take his consulting feedback into the curriculum meeting with him, etc. (p. 5).

As in JHE in the late 1960s, the remaining articles (those which do not focus on women, use sex/gender as a variable, use gender-inclusive language or another indication that women exist) contain no references to works whose titles indicate a focus on women.

Presence of women in the 1980s. In the 1980s women have been discovered! When I added together all the articles counted in the four article categories in the study, I found that 64% of the articles in JHE and 76% in RHE indicated the existence of women. In comparison, the existence of women was apparent in 15% of the articles in JHE in the late 1960s and 32% in the late 1970s. In RHE their existence was apparent in 29% of the articles in the late

1970s (See Tables 2 and 3).

The presence of women as scholars was very evident. In JHE women were primary or sole author of 29 (31%) of the articles and coauthor(s) of 3 (3%). In RHE women were primary or sole author of 34 (42%) and coauthor(s) of 11 (14%). This finding may partially reflect the increase in the number of women higher education faculty from 5% in 1972 as compared to 12% in 1980 and 15% in 1986 (Newell and Kuh 1989).

In spite of the increased presence of women in these journals, few articles in the 1980s focused exclusively on women or on a topic commonly associated with women: seven percent in JHE and one percent in RHE. Probably partly because the number of empirical studies increased in these journals from the 1970s, the percentage of articles using sex/gender as a variable increased. Sex/gender was a variable in 23% of the articles in JHE and 22% in RHE.

The use of gender-inclusive language also increased in the 1980s. None of the articles used only male pronouns when referring to students, faculty, administrators, or other groups in higher education.

Few of the articles not included in the other 3 article counts contained references to works focusing on women: 3% in JHE and 2% in RHE. However, these low figures are misleading if construed to mean that no other articles included references to works focusing on women. Many of the articles contained in the other article counts did contain such references.

Classification by feminist phase theory. Of the more than 500

articles examined in this total, only 16 focused exclusively on women or on a topic commonly associated with them: 14 (4%) of the articles examined in JHE and 2 (1%) of the articles examined in RHE). It is these 16 articles that I classified according to feminist phase theory.[12] One article reflected male scholarship, 4 reflected compensatory, and 11 reflected bifocal.

Male scholarship assumes that the experience of men is universal. The one example of male scholarship was John Andrew's (1978) "Growth of a Teacher," a case study of a young graduate student's efforts to improve her teaching. I classified this article as focusing on women because the graduate student was a women. Both in his capacity as director of the Teacher Development Program and as a psychotherapist at the institution where the young woman (referred to as A.) was a teaching assistant, Andrews worked with the student because they "found that helping her improve her teaching demanded that we help her resolve issues of personal conflict, on the one hand, and institutional power, on the other" (p. 136). When examined from a feminist perspective, the article represents male scholarship in its total omission of the possibility that the gender of the teaching assistant could have been a factor in her poor self-image and in her response to authority, particularly as represented by the graduate professor who was so critical of A's beginning teaching style. Only two sentences hinted at the possibility that gender was part of the dynamics.

We also explored in therapy what contribution A's

> family experiences might have made to her reaction. She portrayed herself as having struggled to live up to the model of a sedate, controlled "lady" according to the image of a traditional Catholic environment, which she experienced at home and school" (p. 142).

Otherwise, Andrews never dealt with the interplay of sex/gender (let alone race or social class) and personality, teaching style, and attitudes toward authority.

Several articles exemplified compensatory scholarship, that scholarship which focuses on the exceptional woman or women who have succeeded according to male standards. One such article was Ruth E. Eckert's (1979) personal essay about her long career as a higher education scholar, including service at the University of Minnesota from 1938 to her retirement in 1973. In 1972 she received a regents professorship from the University, "making this the only time a woman has received this highest faculty honor, granted to some thirty men since its establishment in 1965" (p. 252). Eckert's career reminiscences provide the reader with a portrait of a female higher education scholar who played by men's rules and succeeded, perhaps in part because she didn't question the rules. Only two remarks indicated awareness of discrimation faced by women. First, she recounted how during her first two years in college, she was bored by her classes but excited by her outside reading in philosophy and theology. She then stated, "How crestfallen I was to discover that women could not aspire to become professors of systematic theology" (p. 234). Later in referring to

a statewide faculty study she conducted in 1968, she commented, "Women's status has improved somewhat . . . , but often not enough to assure merited advancement" (p. 250). This unquestioning acceptance of discrimination against women, combined with the portrait we receive of an exceptional woman who is "as good as" a man, are why this article represents compensatory scholarship.

Published ten years later, Gabriel Bar-Haim and John M. Wilkes' (1989) article, "A Cognitive Interpretation of the Marginality and Underrepresentation of Women in Science," was another example of compensatory scholarship which did not recognize that women might be oppressed organizationally. While Bar-Haim and Wilkes acknowledged that women are underrepresented and have a "marginal position" (p. 371) in the sciences, they did not ascribe this problem to discrimination against women:

> But to attribute really extensive damage to unequal treatment puts into question the entire process of peer review and the elaborate precautions--of which scientists are so proud--that are taken to preserve objectivity. To question these procedures is to question the entire process of scientific validation" (p. 372).

Instead the authors maintained that "the explanation should be derived from the differences and the conflict between cognitive styles of researchers and not from differences and conflict between women and men per se" (p. 373). However, this statement wass somewhat contradicted later when the authors say," [W]hat we wish to argue is that the women who choose science as a career are

different as a group from the men who do, and hence the difference in the course that the careers of the two sexes take" (p. 377). The authors maintained that a mismatch in cognitive style and type of scientific career results in women avoiding or dropping out of a scientific career. For there to be more women in science, women will have to be far more self-aware than men as to their cognitive styles and the type of scientific career most appropriate to the style (p. 384). In other words individual women, not the academy, will have to bear the responsibility for seeing that there are more women in scientific careers. How do they do this? By being better than men, i. e., more self-aware. Expecting women to do something extra that men don't have to do to attain the same goal is typical of compensatory scholarship.

William Hamovitch and Richard D. Morgenstern's (1977) "Children and the Productivity of Academic Women" also demonstrated compensatory scholarship. The authors examined "the relationship, if any, between fertility and both scholarly productivity and professional status" (p. 634) among women faculty. Although the data base used in the study contained information about the scholarly productivity and number of children of male scholars, no analysis of these data was included for comparative purposes. Underlying this study were 1) the unstated assumption that having children does not interfere with men's scholarly productivity, and 2) the unspecified male norm that having children should not have a negative effect upon scholarly productivity. As is typical in compensatory scholarship, women in the study were expected to meet

male standards, with no questioning of the standards themselves.

Julia A. Heath and Howard P. Tuckman's (1989) "The Impact on Labor Markets of the Relative Growth of New Female Doctorates" represented compensatory scholarship by its evaluating women's behavior by male standards. Studying the growth in female doctorates, the authors reported that male doctoral recipients were much more likely to seek full-time employment and to be employed than were women doctoral recipients. Given that women doctoral recipients were more likely to opt for part-time employment, "the relative growth in women doctorates may result in a loss to society in the use of new doctorates" (p. 712). The inference is that women who choose to work part-time are failing or cheating society. The authors seemed to be expecting women to meet male standards of what is best for society, i.e., full-time employment, without acknowledging that women who choose to work part-time for a variety of reasons may be contributing to society, albeit in different ways than full-time employment. This underlying assumption that women must meet male standards is typical of compensatory scholarship.

The majority of articles which focused on women were published in the late 1980s and reflected bifocal scholarship. Bifocal scholarship conceives human experience in dualistic categories such as male and female. Women and men are seen as "'complementary but equal'" (Tetreault 1985, p. 369). The oppression of women is often a topic, and the pervasive influence of the male experience on disciplinary content, structure, and methodology is also noted (Tetreault 1985).

M.M. Chambers' (1967) "Operation Second Chance: Mature Women in College and Graduate School," exemplified this phase's attitude that women, viewed as a homogeneous group, are "complementary but equal" to men, also viewed as a homogeneous group. According to Chambers, "mature" women have their own unique contribution to make to higher education and should be valued for it:

> In the main, the type of women that I have in mind [to attend college and graduate school] will not demand special treatment. They will not need coddling. They will hold their own in academic competition with their younger classmates and contribute not only financial support to the college or university, but an element of academic strength of a character that could come only from them (p. 211).

Another article which exemplified bifocal scholarship in its treatment of women and men as separate but equal, homogeneous groups was Stephanie L. Witt and Nicholas P. Lovrich's (1988) "Sources of Stress Among Faculty: Gender Differences." Seeking to determine if there was "a gender-based difference in stress between men and women" (p. 274), the authors concluded that there were areas in which women faculty experienced more stress than men faculty. Unlike compensatory scholarship, the authors did not expect women to be more like men in dealing with their stress.

In "Cornell's Old Girl Network and Organizational Change 1906-1921," Gailyn D. Casaday (1980) provided a historical look at the ways Cornell alumnae worked to ensure that women students were well

served by the university. In its delineation of alumnae efforts, the article reflected that component of bifocal scholarship which examines "ordinary women's efforts to overcome oppression, particularly through women's organizations and networks" (Tetreault 1985, p. 374). Also, in presenting this case study of women who served as "change agents" through small, incremental steps (p. 22), Casaday noted the limitations of leadership theory which assumes that change occurs through a "great man" acting as change agent:

> Perhaps one reason so little of women's history has been recorded or analyzed is the virtual absence of the female equivalent of "great men." In order to understand women's historical role as change agents, we must be able to transcend a "great man" theory of leadership and to note the activities of coalitions of women over time" (p. 22).

Acknowledging that existing theories (in this case, those about leadership and change) do not fit women's experience is also typical of bipolar scholarship.

In "Administrative Mobility and Gender: Patterns and Processes in Higher Education," Mary Ann D. Sagaria (1988) "examine[d] the collective consequences of the hiring and promotion activities on the job mobility for women and men administrators during the 1970s" (p. 311). The article reflected bifocal scholarship in its emphasis on the differences between male and female administrative career patterns and on the discrimination faced by women administrators in their efforts to advance professionally. As did Casaday, Sagaria also noted the inability of prevailing theory to

incorporate or account for women's experiences:

> The major points about the illusion of equal opportunity and the potential risk associated with hiring women from outside organziations have not thus far been incorporated to any great extent into labor market models (p. 324).

Several articles focused on topics usually associated with women: discrimination in employment decisions (Rothstein 1989), sexual harassment (Schneider 1987), the concept of comparable worth (Braskamp, Muffo, and Langston 1978; Lee, Leslie, and Olswang 1987), affirmative action (Hanna 1988; Loeb, Farber, and Lowry 1978), and a "chilly climate" in the classroom (Constantinople, Cornelius, and Gray 1988). These articles were bifocal in that they discussed various forms of oppression experienced by women in the academy.

In sum, during the years examined in this study mainstream higher education scholarship, as represented in the pages of the Journal of Higher Education and Review of Higher Education, reflected compensatory or bifocal thinking about women. While both compensatory and bifocal scholarship were published in the late 1970s and late 1980s, most articles published in the late 1980s reflected bifocal thinking about women. Scholarship which incorporated feminist thinking in its examination of women's experiences within the academy was nonexistent. It is interesting to compare this finding with that of Twombly (in press) in her study of the literature about community college students, faculty, and administrators. While Twombly found that the bulk of

scholarship represented the bifocal or compensatory phase of thinking about women, she did find some articles which represented feminist thinking and even a couple which represented a multifocal perspective. Unlike this study, she found that the quantity of scholarship focusing on women declined from the 1970s to the 1980s. I found the opposite although the growth from the 1970s to the 1980s occurred in only the Journal of Higher Education, not in The Review.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Through its focus on the economic, political, and social constraints placed upon women, contemporary feminism has been a catalyst in the creation of a very different academy than that of the late 1960s. The percent of women faculty in colleges and universities has increased from approximately 19% in the late 1960s (Bayer and Astin 1975) to 29% in the mid 1980s (Touchton and Davis 1991). There are also many more women administrators, e.g., 11% of college and university presidents in 1989, 27% of academic deans in 1987, and 25% of chief student affairs officers in 1987 (Touchton and Davis 1991). In these positions women regularly conduct research and report their findings in scholarly journals such as Journal of Higher Education and Review of Higher Education as this study's figures on female authorship have shown. To reach these positions of authority, women must attend college, which they are now doing in greater numbers than men students. In the late 1960s

less than 40% of the undergraduate student body was female. In the late 1980s the majority (53%) of students were female (Stern 1988). Additionally, both within and outside the academy, the feminist movement beginning in the 1960s "raised people's consciousness" about using gender-inclusive language. As a consequence, women as a part of the human race are much more visible in printed materials (whether they be academic journals or Time magazine) than they were twenty or thirty years ago.

However, feminism and feminist scholarship cannot be considered to have significantly influenced the dominant scholarship of a field or discipline just because there are now more women scholars and greater use of gender-inclusive language. The influence of feminist scholarship is felt when a discipline begins to rethink its major theoretical orientations and research paradigms from a feminist perspective. When compared to education as a whole, American[13] higher education as a field of study has been slow to manifest in its mainstream journals the influence of feminist scholarship. Whereas journals which focus on K-12 education were publishing in the late 1960s articles focusing on women (DuBois et al 1985), a major higher education journal, the Journal of Higher Education, published during 1967-69 only one article (Chambers 1867) focusing on women. Higher education scholarship as represented in JHE in the late 1960s and late 1970s and in RHE in the late 1970s did not commonly use sex/gender as a variable in its empirical studies, unlike research in K-12 education (DuBois et al 1985; Jones 1990). However, by the late

1980s women as a subject of inquiry and sex/gender as a variable in empirical studies were fairly common in these journals, particularly in JHE. Still, many studies conducted by higher education scholars represented in these journals did little more than "add women and stir." Studies on women's experiences were rare, while studies reflecting a feminist perspective, as described in feminist phase theory, were nonexistent in both journals during the periods in this study. However, evolution in thinking about women was apparent. The JHE primarily reflected only male scholarship in the late 1960s, while by the late 1980s its articles dealing with women's experiences were most apt to reflect bifocal scholarship.

It is unclear why higher education as a field of study has been slow to conduct scholarship focusing on women and to reflect feminist thinking about women. Perhaps one reason is because higher education is a relatively new field of study. As a multidisciplinary and thus derivative field of study, higher education experiences a time lag in the infusion of new disciplinary perspectives. The influence of innovative paradigms such as feminism has to trickle down from the disciplines that provide higher education with its conceptual frameworks and methodologies.

Another reason may be that scholarship reflecting a feminist orientation was rejected by editors and reviewers during the time periods in this study. As one who was an associate editor of the Review of Higher Education during one of the time periods in this

study, it is not my sense that this occurred during the late 1980s. Rather during this time period at least, examples of feminist scholarship were not submitted to The Review. Perhaps that was because authors assumed feminist thinking about women would not be accepted, given that so few articles even focusing on women had previously appeared in The Review. Here editors find themselves in a Catch-22 situation. Scholars don't submit innovative scholarship to a mainstream journal because they fear it won't be published, thereby contributing to the journal's reflecting only traditional or mainstream thinking about topics. A search of less well-known higher education journals, particularly those focusing on a particular segment or sector of higher education such as student affairs or the community college might well indicate a greater awareness of women in these journals than in JHE and RHE as well as some articles reflecting feminist thinking about women. The examples of feminist scholarship which Twombly (in press) found in her examination of community college literature on women were in journals of limited distribution even within the community college sector.

It is also possible that status concerns have inhibited higher education scholars from adopting and reflecting a feminist perspective in their scholarship. DuBois et al (1985) speculated that education as a fairly new field of study has been slow to "accept new scholarship on women until the other [disciplines], whose legitimacy in the academy is less tenuous, have already done so" (p. 177). Research that focuses on and values women may be

seen as less significant than research which focuses on and implicitly glorifies male behavior as the norm. For individual scholars awareness of this attitude can translate into a concern that doing feminist scholarship may harm one's chances for tenure or promotion.[15]

Regardless of the reasons, feminist scholarship conducted by higher education scholars and published in mainstream higher education journals is rare.[16] As one who believes in the value of a feminist perspective and in its potential to redefine the academy, I believe that feminist scholarship needs to become part of mainstream research in the study of higher education. That day will have arrived when studies of "the gender-specific connotations of certain fields of knowledge" (Thomas 1990, p.7) examine why men are underrepresented in traditionally female fields such as nursing as well as why women are underrepresented in traditionally masculine fields such as science and math. That day will have arrived when studies of the effect of increasing numbers of women in various academic fields will focus on how the fields have been enhanced rather than on how men are leaving the field or average salaries have declined. That day will have arrived when organizational theory reflects an understanding of the "effect . . . one's gender identification ha[s] on behavior and effectiveness in organizations" (Shakeshaft 1989, p. 328) **and** does not regard the effects of male identification as the desired norm. In short, when gender (one's own as well as that of others) is seen as one of the major variables (others being class, race/ethnicity, sexual

preference, and marital status) affecting the experiences of both men and women, feminist scholarship will be mainstream.

Perhaps then higher education scholars may move to the multifocal or relational phase where maleness and femaleness will no longer be viewed as polarities but as dimensions on a continuum of humanness, and humanity's almost infinite variety will be examined and celebrated. To achieve this goal, higher education scholars need to examine their past and current scholarship and move forward to a new phase in their thinking about women.

TABLE 1

JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

IN THE 1960S

	1967		1968		1969	
Number of Articles in Which:	#	%	#	%	#	%
Women were central focus	1	.02	0	.00	0	.00
Gender was a variable	0	.00	0	.00	2	.04
Gender-inclusive lang. used or other ind. women exist*	5	.09	6	.10	11	.21
Ref(s). made to fem. lit.*	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Woman was primary author	1	.02	3	.05	5	.09
Woman was coauthor+	0	.00	2	.03	2	.04
Total Articles Examined**	56		57		53	

* Excludes articles included in other three article categories

** Includes articles, commentaries, and review essays but not book reviews.

\+ Could be coauthor to primary author of either gender

TABLE 2

JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

IN 1970S AND 1980S

	1977		1978		1979	
Number of Articles in Which:	#	%	#	%	#	%
Women were central focus	1	.02	3	.07	1	.03
Gender was a variable	6	.15	3	.07	4	.11
Gender-inclusive lang. used or other ind. women exist*	6	.15	8	.19	5	.14
Ref(s). made to fem. lit.	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Woman was primary author	2	.05	7	.17	8	.23
Woman was coauthor+	2	.05	3	.07	4	.11
Total Articles Examined**	41		41		35***	

	1987		1988		1989	
Number of Articles in Which:	#	%	#	%	#	%
Women were central focus	2	.06	3	.10	3	.03
Gender was a variable	9	.28	6	.21	7	.21
Gender-inclusive language or other indic. women exist*	10	.16	9	.31	9	.27
Ref(s). made to fem. lit.*	8	.25	11	.38	9	.27
Woman was primary author	6	.19	10	.34	9	.27
Woman was coauthor+	1	.03	1	.03	1	.03
Total Articles Examined**	32		29		33	

* Excludes articles included in other three article categories

** Includes articles, commentaries, and review essays (but not book reviews)

*** Does not include 21 articles which are reprints in this 50th anniversary issue

\+ Could be coauthor to primary author of either gender

TABLE 3

REVIEW OF HIGHER EDUCATION

BY YEARS

	1977-1978		1978-1979		1979-1980	
Number of Articles in Which:	#	%	#	%	#	%
Women were central focus	0	.00	0	.00	1	.06
Gender was a variable	1	.07	1	.06	1	.06
Gender-inclusive lang. used or other ind. women exist*	2	.13	3	.18	5	.29
Ref(s). made to fem. lit.*	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Woman was primary author	1	.07	2	.11	3	.18
Woman was coauthor+	0	.00	1	.06	0	.00
Total Articles Examined**	15		17		16	

	1987-1988		1988-1989		1989-1990	
Number of Articles in Which:	#	%	#	%	#	%
Women were central focus	1	.04	0	.00	0	.00
Gender was a variable	7	.26	2	.07	9	.35
Gender-inclusive lang. used or other ind. women exist*	9	.33	17	.61	15	.58
Ref(s). made to fem. lit.*	1	.04	1	.04	0	.00
Woman was primary author	10	.37	15	.54	9	.35
Woman was coauthor+	3	.11	4	.14	4	.15
Total Articles Examined**	27		28		26	

* Excludes articles included in other three article categories

** Includes ongoing dialogues and review essays as well as regular articles

\+ Could be coauthor to primary author of either gender

1. The education journals used in this study were as follows: American Education Research Journal, Child Development, Elementary School Journal, Harvard Educational Review, Journal of Educational Measurement, Journal of Educational Psychology, Journal of Educational Research, Review of Educational Research, School Review, Teacher's College Record.

2. See also L. Jones, "The Gender Difference Hypothesis: A Synthesis of Research Findings," in Educational Administration Quarterly, 26 (1), 5-37, 1990.

3. The journals in this study were the following: American Educational Research Journal, Journal of College Student Personnel, Journal of Counseling Psychology, Journal of Educational Psychology, Journal of Higher Education, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, Personnel and Guidance Journal, Research in Higher Education, Review of Higher Education, and Sociology of Education.

4. The journals were College and University, Educational Record, Higher Education, Journal of College Student Personnel, Journal of Higher Education, Liberal Education, Research in Higher Education, and Review of Higher Education.

5. The journals were as follows: Academy of Management Journal, Administrative Management, Administrative Science Quarterly, Advanced Management, American Economic Review, Business & Economic Review of South Carolina, Business Horizons, Business Topics, California Management Review, Harvard Business Review, Journal of Academy of Marketing Science, Journal of Advertising, Journal of Advertising Research, Journal of Business, Journal of Business Communications, Journal of Business Research, Journal of Communications, Journal of Consumer Affairs, Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Contemporary Business, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Retailing, Personnel Administrator, Personnel Journal, Public Opinion Quarterly, Quarterly Journal of Economics.

6. The journals were Central States Speech Journal, Communication Education, Communication Monographs, Communication Quarterly, Human Communication Research, Journal of Communication, Quarterly Journal of Speech, Southern Speech Communication Journal, Western Journal of Speech Communication.

7. In conducting this study, I assumed that feminist scholarship could have influenced mainstream scholarship both indirectly and directly. I assumed that the authorship of mainstream scholarship would be indirectly influenced through the increased number of women faculty and therefore women scholars who write for

publication. Additionally, I assumed that to portray higher education institutions accurately, scholarship about higher education would have to reflect the increasing numerical presence of women student, faculty, and administrators in higher education, another indirect influence of the feminist movement and feminist scholarship. Regarding the direct influence of feminist scholarship, I assumed that the feminist movement's encouragement of gender-inclusive language would influence the language of mainstream scholarship. Next, I assumed that while inclusion of sex/gender as a control variable can be criticized when there is no "theoretical reason to believe that there might be differences between women and men on the variables of interest" (Twombly 1991), an increase in the use of sex/gender as a variable would be largely the result of feminist scholarship's emphasis on researching women. I also assumed that an increase in research which focuses on women only or on a topic commonly associated with women would be a manifestation of the direct influence of feminist scholarship. My final assumption was that mainstream higher education journals' inclusion of research classified as feminist according to feminist phase theory would be a indication of the direct influence of feminist scholarship upon the study of higher education.

8. From now on I will use the word "article" to refer to the articles, essay reviews, and "Short Contributions" that were examined in this study.

9. If the gender of the author was not apparent, I assumed the author was male.

10. The full name of the author was given in the article so that the female gender of the author was immediately apparent.

11. It is important to note that almost everything I say in this section about the presence of women could be said about minorities. If articles did not usually convey the existence of women in higher education, neither did they convey the existence of minorities. If gender was not used as a variable in a quantitative study, neither was ethnicity. However, in JHE in the late 1960s, there were several articles which focused on "Negro" students, whereas only one article during this time focused on women.

12. Women were the primary or sole author of 11 (69%) of these articles. Four articles focused on students, 8 on faculty, 1 on administrators, and 3 on graduates. One article was published in the late 1960s, 5 in the late 1970s through 1980, and 10 in the late 1980s.

13. For an example of feminist scholarship about British higher education, see Kim Thomas's Gender and Subject in Higher Education (1990), which examines the interplay between selected disciplines

(English, physics, and communication) and gender in British higher education.

15. Anecdotal evidence for this includes a recent conversation with one of my male colleagues at Loyola. After strongly suggesting to me that I not limit myself to such "narrow" scholarship, he reminded me that I was coming up for tenure this year.

16. Examples of feminist research on higher education conducted by higher education scholars about include Estela Bensimon's (in press) "A Feminist Reinterpretation of Presidents' Definitions of Leadership," in which she used gender theory to reexamine her previous scholarship on presidential leadership; and Susan Twombley's (in press) "What We Know about Women in Community Colleges: An Examination of the Literature Using Feminist Phase Theory," in which she uses feminist phase theory to illustrate a decline in interest in gender issues in the community college.

REFERENCES

Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Andrews, J. D. W. (1978). Growth of a teacher. Journal of Higher Education, 49 (2), 136-150.

Bayer, A., & Astin, H. S. (1975). Sex differentials in the academic reward system. Science, 188, 796-802.

Bean, J. P., & Kuh, G. D. (1988). The relationship between author gender and the methods and topics used in the study of college students. Research in Higher Education, 28 (2), 130-144.

Beardsley, T. B. (1977). Survival tactics for the ailing college administrator. Journal of Higher Education, 48 (4), 472-474.

Bensimon, E. (in press). A feminist reinterpretation of presidents' definitions of leadership. Peabody Journal.

Bess, J. L. (Fall 1977). The academic profession in transition. Review of Higher Education, 1 (1), 3-12.

Braskamp, L. A., Muffo, J. A., & Langston III, I. W. (1978). Determining salary equity. Journal of Higher Education, 49 (3), 231-246.

Chambers, M. M. (1967). Operation second chance: Mature women in college and graduate school. Journal of Higher Education, 38 (4), 206-211.

Collins, R. G. (1967). Notes on the Parsons Experiment. Journal of Higher Education, 38 (8), 428-437.

Constantinople, A., Cornelius, R., & Gray, J. (1988). The chilly climate: Fact or artifact? Journal of Higher Education, 60 (6), 704-715.

Corson, J. (1969). From authority to leadership. Journal of Higher Education, 40 (3), 181-192.

DuBois, E. C., Kelly, G. P., Kennedy, E. L., Korsmeyer, C. W., & Robinson, L. S. (1985). Feminist scholarship: Kindling in the groves of academe. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Eckert, R. E. (1979). A journey toward understanding. Journal of Higher Education, 50 (3), 233-255.

Farnham, C., (Ed.). (1987). The impact of feminist research in the academy. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Firestone, W. A. (1987). Meaning as method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research. Educational Researcher, 16 (7), 16-21.

Gordon, L. (1990). Gender and higher education in the progressive era. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hamovitch, W., & Morgenstern, R. D. (1977). Children and the productivity of academic women. Journal of Higher Education, 48 (6), 633-645.

Harding, S., ed. (1987). Feminism and methodology: Social science issues. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, S., & Hintikka, M. B. eds. (1983). Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology and philosophy of science. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Heath, J., & Tuckman, H. (1989). The impact on labor markets of the

relative growth of new female doctorates. Journal of Higher Education, 60 (6), 704-715.

Holmes, R. W. (1969). A proposal for the undergraduate college: A school of language. Journal of Higher Education, 40 (4), 253-273.

Horowitz, H. L. (1984). Alma mater: Design and experience in the women's colleges from their nineteenth century beginnings to the 1950s. New York Alfred A. Knopf.

Kellams, S. F. (1977). ASHE membership survey results. HIgher Education Review, 1 (1), 39-44.

Jones, L. (1990). The gender difference hypothesis: A synthesis of research findings. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26 (1), 5-37.

Keller, E. F. (1985). Reflections on gender and science. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Komarovsky, M. (1985). Women in college: Shaping new feminine identities. New York: Basic Books.

Kuh, G. D., Bean, J. P., Bradley, R. K., Coomes, M. D., & Hunter, D. E. (1986). Changes in research on college students published in selected journals between 1969 and 1983. Review of Higher Education, 9 (2), 177-192.

Langland, E., & Gove, W., Eds. (1981). A feminist perspective in the academy: The difference it makes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Landry, R. (1967). The utilitarian in freshman English. Journal of Higher Education, 38 (1), 1-8.

Laser, M. (1967). Toward a sense of community. Journal of Higher

Education, 38 (2), 61-69.

Loeb, J. W., Ferber, M. A., & Lowry, H. A. (1978). The effectiveness of affirmative action for women. Journal of Higher Education, 49 (3), 218-230.

MacGregor, J., & McInnis, R. G. (1977). Integrating classroom instruction and library research: The cognitive functions of bibliographic network structures. Journal of Higher Education, 48 (1), 17-38.

Neitz, M. J. (1989). Sociology and feminist scholarship. American Sociologist, 20, 3-13.

Newell, J. L., & Kuh, G. (1989). Taking stock: The higher education professoriate. Review of Higher Education, 13 (1), 63-90.

Plante, P. (1968). An experimental freshman program in the humanities. Journal of Higher Education, 39 (4), 209-213.

Richardson, J. T. E. (1991). The menstrual cycle and student learning. Journal of Higher Education, 62 (3), 317-340.

Sagaria, M. A. D. (1988). Administrative mobility and gender: Patterns and processes in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 59 (3), 305-326.

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). The gender gap in research on educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 25 (4), 324-337.

Silverman, R. J. (1987). How we know what we know: A study of higher education journal articles. Review of Higher Education, 11 (1), 3 9-59.

Sprague, J., & Zimmerman, M. K. (1989). Quality and quantity:

Reconstructing feminist methodology. American Sociologist, 20, 71-85.

Solomon, B. M. (1985). In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education in America. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sorenson, G., & Kagan, D. (1967). Conflict between doctoral candidates and their sponsors. Journal of Higher Education, 38 (1), 17-24.

Stern, J. D., ed. (1988). The condition of education: postsecondary education 1988, Vol. 2. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Tetreault, M. K. (1985). Feminist phase theory: An Experience-Based Evaluation Model. Journal of Higher Education, 56 (4), 363-384.

Thomas, K. (1990). Gender and subject in higher education. Buckingham MK: SHRE and Open University Press.

Touchton, J. G., & Davis, L. (1991). Fact book on women in higher education. New York: Ace/MacMillan.

Townsend, B. K. (1990, November). A feminist perspective in research with implications for the study of higher education. In B. K. Townsend (Chair), A Feminist Perspective in the Study of Higher Education. Distinguished symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, Oregon.

Treichler, P. A. (1985). Alma mater's sorority: Women and the University of Illinois, 1890-1925. Paula A. Treichler, Cheris

Kramoare, and Beth Stafford (Eds.), For alma mater: \theory and practice in feminist scholarship. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Twombly, S. (in press). What we know about women in community colleges: An examination of the literature using feminist phase theory. Journal of Higher Education.

Walters, C. G., Fry, E. F., & Chaisson, B. D. (1990). Women scholars: Closing the publication gap. Research in Higher Education, 31 (4), 355-367.

Witt, S. L., & Lovrich, N. P. (1988). Sources of stress among faculty: Gender differences. Review of Higher Education, 11 (3), 269-284.

Yeakey, C. C., Johnston, G. S., & Adkison, J. A. (1986). In pursuit of equity: A review of research on minorities and women in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22 (3), 110-149.